

### Remarks

The Supplemental Preliminary Amendment filed June 18, 2004 addresses all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action of September 24, 2003 in the immediate parent application (Serial No. 10/368,366), except for the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 12 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 based on the phrase “a minimum reflectivity which is 0.5% or lower”, which appears in claims 17 and 21 set forth in the Supplemental Preliminary Amendment.

With regard to this phrase, while any specific low-reflective thin-film substrate will have a specific minimum reflectivity, as shown in any of Figs. 2, 4-6 and 8, each specific embodiment of the low-reflective thin film substrate will have its own specific minimum reflectivity; and the claims are intended to cover all of the embodiments of Figs. 2, 4-6 and 8, as well as other embodiments which are not specifically described in the specification. Accordingly, the use of a range for the minimum reflectivity is appropriate to cover all of the embodiments, since each embodiment may have a different minimum reflectivity from the other embodiments.

On the other hand, the disclosures in the working examples in the specification, although each working example is directed to a specific embodiment of the low-reflective thin film substrate, refer to a minimum (or maximum) reflectivity in terms of a range, for example, as indicated in the last full paragraph on page 9 of the specification, which is part of Example 1. Accordingly, the phrase “or lower” has been deleted at both of lines 5 and 6 from the bottom on page 9. Similar changes have been made in the discussion of Fig. 4 in Examples 2 and 3 on pages 11 and 12, Fig. 5 of Example 4 at the bottom of page 13, Fig. 6 of Example 5 in the second full paragraph on page 15, and Fig. 8 of Example 7 at the bottom of page 16.

There is another inadvertent error at page 9, line 8 from the bottom, which refers to “maximum reflectivity”, whereas “minimum reflectivity” was intended, as apparent from curve A of Fig. 2. This correction has now been made.

Accordingly, Applicants have now addressed all of the objections and rejections previously raised by the Examiner in the immediate parent application, as a result of which the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Tadakatsu SUZUKI

By:



Michael R. Davis  
Registration No. 25,134  
Attorney for Applicant

MRD/pth  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
July 7, 2004